arXiv:1212.4813v1 [math.DS] 19 Dec 2012

ON THE PACKING MEASURE OF SELF-SIMILAR SETS

TUOMAS ORPONEN

ABSTRACT. Building on a recent result of M. Hochman [Ho], we give an example of a self-similar set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} K = s \in (0,1)$ and $\mathcal{P}^s(K) = 0$. This answers a question of Y. Peres and B. Solomyak.

1. INTRODUCTION

We start by quoting Question 2.3 from the survey [PS].

Question 1. *Assume that the Hausdorff-dimension of a self-similar set* $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ *is* $s \in (0,1)$. *Does it follow that* $\mathcal{P}^s(K) > 0$, *where* $\mathcal{P}^s$ *denotes* s*-dimensional packing measure?*

The purpose of this note is to answer the question in the negative by constructing an explicit counterexample. In fact, we construct a self-similar set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ with **similarity** dimension $s := \log 3/\log 4$ such that K has 'no total overlaps' and $\mathcal{P}^s(K) = 0$. Until recently, we were unable to determine if our set K also had **Hausdorff** dimension s. Now this question has been resolved by M. Hochman. We use the following result, the proof of which is the same as [Ho, Theorem 1.6], apart from changing some numerical values:

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $K_u \subset \mathbb{R}$ *be the self-similar set generated by the three similitudes*

$$\psi_0(x) := \frac{x}{4}, \quad \psi_1(x) := \frac{x+1}{4}, \quad \psi_u(x) := \frac{x+u}{4},$$

where $u \in [0,1]$. *Then* $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} K_u = \log 3/\log 4$ *for every* $u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$.

2. THE CONSTRUCTION AND SOME PRELIMINARIES

The self-similar set K answering Question 1 negatively will have the form $K = K_u$ for $u \in [0,1]$ chosen as follows: pick natural numbers $\lambda_j \in \{3^{3^j}, 3^{3^j}+1\}$ in such a manner that

$$u := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 4^{-\lambda_j} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}. \tag{2.1}$$

This is certainly possible, since there are uncountably many admissible sequences $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$, and no two sequences produce the same number u. Theorem 1.1 now implies $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} K_u = \log 3/\log 4 = s$, so it remains to prove that $\mathcal{P}^s(K) = 0$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A80 (Primary); 28A78, 37C45 (Secondary).

The research was supported by the Finnish National Doctoral Programme in Mathematics and its Applications.

According to [PSS, Corollary 2.2], if $\mathcal{P}^s(K) > 0$, then the natural self-similar measure μ supported on K would coincide with a normalised version of restriction of $\mathcal{P}^s$ to K. In particular, this would mean that $\mu \ll \mathcal{P}^s$. Using [Ma, Chapter 6, Exercise 5], we could then infer that

$$\Theta^s_*(\mu, x) := \liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{(2r)^s} < \infty$$

for μ almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, all we need to do is verify the following claim:

Claim 2.2. *Let μ be the natural self-similar measure on $\mathbb{R}$ associated with the system $\{\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_u\}$. Then $\Theta^s_*(\mu, x) = \infty$ at μ almost every point $x \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Here and below, the number u of course has the special form (2.1). The condition $\Theta^s_*(\mu, x) = \infty$ has a natural geometric interpretation, which will be formulated in the next proposition. But first we need to introduce some notation. Let $\mathcal{I}_n$ denote the set of generation n intervals associated with K. More precisely, let $\mathcal{I}_0 = \{[0,1]\}$, and

$$\mathcal{I}_n := \{\psi_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{i_n}([0,1]) : (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \{0,1,u\}^n\}$$

for $n \geq 1$. The natural self-similar measure μ on K then has the property that

$$\mu(J) \geq \frac{\sharp\{I \in \mathcal{I}_n : I \subset J\}}{3^n}$$

for any interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that there exists $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sharp\{(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \{0,1,u\}^n : \psi_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{i_n}(0) \in B(x, C4^{-n})\} = \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

Then $\Theta^s_*(\mu, x) = \infty$.

Proof. Given $M > 0$, we find $n_M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that at least M distinct points of the form $\psi_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{i_n}(0)$ are contained in $B(x, C4^{-n})$ for $n \geq n_M$. The corresponding intervals in $\mathcal{I}_n$ have length 4^{-n}, and are thus contained in $B(x, (C+1)4^{-n})$. This shows that

$$\frac{\mu(B(x,(C+1)4^{-n}))}{(2(C+1)4^{-n})^s} \geq [2(C+1)]^{-s} \cdot \frac{M}{3^n} \cdot 4^{ns} = \frac{M}{[2(C+1)]^s}, \qquad n \geq n_M,$$

which finishes the proof. □

3. PROOF OF $\mathcal{P}^s(K) = 0$

The goal of this section we will demonstrate that the condition in (2.4) is met at μ almost every point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let us begin by introducing some further notation and terminology. Write $\Omega := \{0,1,u\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, and let $\pi \colon \Omega \to \operatorname{spt} \mu = K$ be the projection

$$\pi(\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \psi_{\omega_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{\omega_n}(0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \omega_n \cdot 4^{-n}.$$

Then $\mu = \pi_\sharp \mathbf{P}$, where $\mathbf{P}$ is the natural product measure on Ω. Let $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots) \in \Omega$, and let $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ be indices with $i \leq j$. We say that (ω, j) *is influenced by* (ω, i), if there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i + \lambda_k < j \leq i + \lambda_{k+1}$, and

$$(\omega_i, \omega_{i+\lambda_1}, \ldots, \omega_{i+\lambda_k}) = (u, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k \text{ zeroes}}).$$

Then, define

$$S(\omega, j) := \sharp\{1 \leq i \leq j : (\omega, j) \text{ is influenced by } (\omega, i)\}.$$

The point of this definition is, as we shall see later, that (2.4) holds for all points $x = \pi(\omega) \in K$ such that

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} S(\omega, j) = \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Thus, we need to establish the following:

Claim 3.2. *The equation* (3.1) *is valid* $\mathbf{P}$ *almost surely.*

Proof. We will be done, as soon as we show that

$$\mathbf{P}[\{\omega : \liminf_{j \to \infty} S(\omega, j) \leq M\}] = 0$$

for any given $M \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand,

$$\{\omega : \liminf_{j \to \infty} S(\omega, j) \leq M\} \subset \limsup_{j \to \infty} B_{j,M},$$

where $B_{j,M}$ is the set

$$B_{j,M} = \{\omega : S(\omega, j) \leq M\}.$$

Using the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we get $\mathbf{P}[\limsup B_{j,M}] = 0$, if we manage to prove that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}[B_{j,M}] < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus, (3.3) will imply Claim 3.2.

We are aiming at an upper bound for $\mathbf{P}[B_{j,M}]$. Fix $j \geq \lambda_1$ and choose $k = k(j) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $\lambda_{k+1} \leq j < \lambda_{k+2}$. Then divide the natural numbers between $j - \lambda_{k+1}$ and $j - 1$ into consecutive blocks $I_1, \ldots, I_N$ of length $\lambda_k + 1$ (one of the blocks may be taken larger if necessary). Let $i_1, \ldots, i_N$ be the smallest numbers in these blocks. Then

$$N \asymp \lambda_{k+1}/\lambda_k \asymp 3^{3^{k+1} - 3^k} \geq 3^{3^k}.$$

Now, the blocks I_n are disjoint, so the random variable $X_j \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$X_j(\omega) = \sharp\{1 \leq n \leq N : (\omega_{i_n}, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_1}, \ldots, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_k}) = (u, 0, \ldots, 0)\}$$

has distribution $X_j \sim \mathrm{Bin}(N, p_j)$, where the 'success probability' p_j equals

$$p_j := \mathbf{P}[\{\omega : (\omega_{i_n}, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_1}, \ldots, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_k}) = (u, 0, \ldots, 0)\}] = 3^{-k-1}.$$

We claim that $B_{j,M} \subset \{X_j \leq M\}$. Indeed, suppose that $\omega \in B_{j,M}$. Then, in particular, there are at most M among the numbers i_n, $1 \leq n \leq N$, such that (ω, j) is influenced by (ω, i_n). For the rest of the numbers i_n either

$$(\omega_{i_n}, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_1}, \ldots, \omega_{i_n+\lambda_k}) \neq (u, 0, \ldots, 0) \tag{3.4}$$

or $i_n + \lambda_{k+1} < j$, or $j \leq i_n + \lambda_k$, by definition of the notion of 'influence'. The latter two possibilities are absurd, since $i_n \geq j - \lambda_{k+1}$ and $i_n + \lambda_k \in I_n \subset \{1, \ldots, j-1\}$. Thus, (3.4) must hold for all but at most M numbers i_n, which means that precisely that $X_j(\omega) \leq M$.

The probability $\mathbf{P}[\{X_j \leq M\}]$ can be estimated by the Chernoff bound

$$\mathbf{P}[\{X_j \leq M\}] \leq \exp\left(-2\frac{(N3^{-k-1} - M)^2}{N}\right) \lesssim_M \exp(-3^{3^k - 2k}),$$

so that finally

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}[B_{j,M}] &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_1 - 1} \mathbf{P}[B_{j,M}] + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\lambda_{k+1} \leq j < \lambda_{k+2}} \mathbf{P}[\{X_j \leq 2M\}] \\ &\lesssim_M \lambda_1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{3^{k+2}} \exp(-3^{3^k - 2k}) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

This proves Claim 3.2. □

Finally, it is time to check that the definition of 'influence' makes sense:

Claim 3.5. *Assume that $\omega \in \Omega$ satisfies (3.1). Then $\pi(\omega) \in K$ satisfies (2.4).*

Proof. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$, $j > 1$, and write $x = \pi(\omega)$. Our task is to find many sequences $(i_1, \ldots, i_j) \in \{0, 1, u\}^j$ such that

$$\psi_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{i_j}(0) = \sum_{n=1}^{j} i_n \cdot 4^{-n} \in B(x, C4^{-j}),$$

where $C \geq 1$ is some absolute constant. One such sequence is always obtained by taking $(i_1, \ldots, i_j) = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_j)$, since

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{j} \omega_n \cdot 4^{-n} - x \right| = \sum_{n=j+1}^{\infty} \omega_n \cdot 4^{-n} \asymp 4^{-j}. \tag{3.6}$$

Here is how we find other sequences. Suppose that (ω, j) is influenced by (ω, i) for some $1 \leq i \leq j$. Once again, this means that $i + \lambda_k < j \leq i + \lambda_{k+1}$ and $(\omega_i, \omega_{i+\lambda_1}, \ldots, \omega_{i+\lambda_k}) = (u, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Consider the modified sequence $\tilde{\omega}$, which is otherwise identical with ω, except that the symbol u at index i is replaced by 0, and the zeroes at the indices $i + \lambda_1, \ldots, i + \lambda_k$ are replaced by 1. Then, using the definition of u, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{n=1}^{j} \omega_n \cdot 4^{-n} - \sum_{n=1}^{j} \tilde{\omega}_n \cdot 4^{-n}\Big| &\\ &= |(u-0)\cdot 4^{-i} + (0-1)\cdot 4^{-(i+\lambda_1)} + \ldots + (0-1)\cdot 4^{-(i+\lambda_k)}|\\ &= \left|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 4^{-i-\lambda_n} - \sum_{n=1}^{k} 4^{-i-\lambda_k}\right| = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} 4^{-i-\lambda_n} \lesssim 4^{-j},\end{aligned}$$

since $i + \lambda_{k+1} \geq j$. It follows from this and (3.6) that $\psi_{\tilde{\omega}_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{\tilde{\omega}_j}(0) \in B(x, C4^{-j})$ for some absolute constant $C \geq 1$. Thus, for each (ω, i) influencing (ω, j), the construction just described produces a sequence $(i_1, \ldots, i_j)$ with $\psi_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ \psi_{i_j}(0) \in B(x, C4^{-j})$.

Moreover, no sequence $(i_1, \ldots, i_j)$ is obtained twice in this manner. For if (ω, j) is influenced by both (ω, i) and (ω, i') with $i < i'$, say, then

- $\omega_i = u$, by definition of (ω, i) influencing (ω, j), and
- both i and i' give rise to modified sequences $\tilde{\omega}$ and $\tilde{\omega}'$, as above.

Recalling how these sequences were constructed, we see that $\tilde{\omega}_i = 0$. On the other hand, $\tilde{\omega}'$ coincides with ω for all indices smaller than i', so in particular $\tilde{\omega}'_i = \omega_i = u$. This means that $\tilde{\omega} \neq \tilde{\omega}'$ and completes the proof of the claim. □

To conclude the proof of our assertion $\mathcal{P}^s(K) = 0$, we note that, by the previous claim, the set $G = \{x : (2.4) \text{ holds at } x\}$ contains the π-images of all those sequences $\omega \in \Omega$ where (3.1) holds. The set consisting of such sequences has full $\mathbf{P}$-measure according to Claim 3.2, whence the equation $\mu = \pi_\sharp \mathbf{P}$ implies full μ-measure for G.

REFERENCES

[Ho] M. HOCHMAN: *On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy*, arXiv:1212.1873

[Ma] P. MATTILA: *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces*, Cambridge University Press, 1995

[PS] Y. PERES AND B. SOLOMYAK: *Problems on Self-Similar Sets and Self-Affine Sets: An Update*, preprint (1999)

[PSS] Y. PERES, K. SIMON AND B. SOLOMYAK: *Self-Similar Sets of Zero Hausdorff Measure and Positive Packing Measure*, Israel J. Math. **117** (2000), pp. 353-379

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, P.O.B. 68, FI-00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND

E-mail address: `tuomas.orponen@helsinki.fi`